REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action has been carefully considered. The issues raised are traversed and addressed below with reference to the relevant headings and paragraph numbers appearing under the Detailed Action of the Office Action.

Advisory Action

The Examiner issued an advisory action dated 12 January 2005, indicating that this was in response to the reply filed 20 December 2004. We note however that the response to which the Examiner refers was supplemental to our response of 31 August 2004, and was therefore filed in response of the Office Action of 22 June 2004, as set out in the response.

In view of this, we believe that issuance of the advisory Office Action was inappropriate. Despite this, it was our intention to file an RCE application, and we are therefore drawing this to the Examiner's attention merely to highlight that our supplemental amendment was not intended to address the issues raised by the Examiner in her final Office Action.

Claim Objections – 35 USC § 103

In response to the Examiner's objections raised against claims 1, 4 and 5 we are submitting herewith further revised claims for the Examiner's consideration.

We appreciate the Examiner's clarification in the "Response to Arguments" section as to why the Examiner was unwilling to accept our previous arguments, and in particular, that the term "having its own location on the bill" would be interpreted as broadly as possible and that as a consequence this would not overcome the prior art objections.

In considering the Examiner's interpretation of the term, this has highlighted that the use of such a term in the response of 26 August 2004 was inappropriate. Additionally, we note that some of our statements made regarding location were misleading and in view of this, have cancelled these amendments made to the claims in our previous response.

In particular, the statement on page 13, paragraph 2 of our response of 26 August 2004 indicates that independent claims 1, 4 and 5 were amended to refer to the coded data being

indicative of its own location on the form and that this is an essential feature of the invention. As will no doubt be appreciated by the Examiner, this is simply incorrect. As described for example on page 20, line 16 to page 21, line 10 of the specification, the invention encompasses two main forms of tagging scheme including "location indicating" tags and "object indicating" tags. Whilst the "location indicating" tags can be mapped to a location through a corresponding tag map, the object indicating tags are not necessarily indicative of their own location. This is clarified by the fact that the tags are provided in zones, with each tag in the zone being identical and therefore indistinguishable, as set out on page 21, line 1.

As will be appreciated by the Examiner, if the tags are indistinguishable, it is impossible to determine a precise location of each tag and therefore the tags and hence the coded data is not indicative of its own location.

Thus, having considered the Examiner's response further, we acknowledge that the previous amendment was inappropriate and therefore retract the misleading statements contained therein.

In any event, in view of the prior art objections raised against the claims the claims have now been further revised to clarify that the bill contains human readable information indicative of at least one parameter and that this is provided coincident with some coded data. The claim therein clarifies that the sensing device senses the coded data provided coincident with the information relating to the at least one parameter, allowing the position to be determined. It will be appreciated by the Examiner that this corresponds to the location indicating form of the invention set out on page 20 of the specification.

A basis for the information being indicative of the parameter can be found for example on page 11, which discusses how the graphic 8 corresponds to zone 7 defining a submit button.

Claim 4 has been revised to remove reference to the coded data being indicative of the location and now clarifies that the coded data is provided coincident with human readable information indicative of the at least one parameter. It will therefore be clear to the Examiner that this corresponds to the object indicating form of the invention set out on page 21.

Claim 5 has also been revised to remove reference to the coded data being indicative of the location and clarifies that again the coded data is provided coincident with at least some human readable information. It will be appreciated by the Examiner that this therefore covers both the object and location indicating forms of the invention described on pages 20 and 21.

In any event, we respectfully submit that these amendments now define novel and inventive subject matter over the prior art.

In particular, neither Perazza nor Mallicoat describes an arrangement which would allow coded data to be provided coincident with human readable information. In particular, both of these documents describe only the use of visible coded data and it will be appreciated that if visible coded data were provided coincident with human readable information, this would render the information illegible so that it would no longer be human-readable.

In this regard, we note that the Examiner has drawn our attention to the Xerox reference which describes invisible data and acknowledge that this would, on the face of it, allow coded data to be provided coincident with human readable information.

However, we would like to draw the Examiner's attention to the fact that the Xerox reference explicitly states on pages 8 and 9 that the printed pages are provided by having a coded substrate supplier produce sheets of paper including the coded data in the form of UV markings. This constitutes a first printing step. The coded substrate supplier then provides the sheets to a publisher who prints in standard ink visible marks thereon. This corresponds to a second and separate subsequent printing step.

In view of this, we believe that the Xerox reference does not describe a mechanism which would allow coded data and information, which are coincident, to be printed substantially simultaneously.

Even if the teachings of Perazza and the Xerox reference are combined, this would still not lead to teaching a process that would allow coincident coded data and information to be printed substantially simultaneously. In particular, the printing process taught in Xerox is a

distinct process required to allow invisible coded data to be provided. No mechanism is suggested in the Xerox reference which would allow the coded data and information to be printed substantially simultaneously. Thus, a combination of these documents may teach that Perazza could utilise invisible coded data, as in Xerox, but this would also require that the printing process proposed by Xerox is used. Thus, a combination of the teaching of these two documents would not allow us to provide information and coincident coded data to be printed substantially simultaneously.

In view of this, we believe that the claims as revised are both novel and inventive over the cited prior art.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant: _____
KIA SILVERBROOK

Applicant: _____
PAUL LAPSTUN

Applicant: _____
SIMON ROBERT WALMSLEY

Applicant: _____
JACQUELINE LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762